(27)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 3703 of 2007

Petitioner		Laxman Singh, S/o Shri Ram Singh, Aged about – 29 years, R/o Block 11/C Street No.1, Sector 4, Bhilai Tehsil & District Durg, C.G.
	Versus	
Respondents	1.	Union of India, Through the Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi
	2.	Steel Authority of India Limited, Through its Managing Director, Bhilai Steel Plant, Ispat Bhawan, Bhilai Nagar, Tehsil & District Durg (C.G.)
	3.	Manager (Personnel – Recruitment) Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai, District Durg, (C.G.)
	4.	Assem Kumar S/o Dewaji Borkar
	5.	Rakesh Yadav S/o Laiman Yadav
	6.	Mirza Irfan Baig S/o Mirza Masood Baig
	7.	Shrinivas S/o Shanker
	8.	Harendra Kumar S/o Lt. Kailash Singh All R/4 to R/8 are represented through C/o Manager (Personnel-Recruitment) Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai, District Durg, (C.G.)

Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution Of India

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Present : Shri Jitendra Gupta, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Anupam Dubey, Advocate on behalf of Thakur Vijay Singh Asst. Solicitor General.

ORDER

(Passed on this 2nd day of July, 2007)

(1) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that pursuant to advertisement dated 25.03.2007 (Annexure P-2) the petitioner applied for appointment on the post of Fire Engine Driver cum Pump Operator. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is fully qualified for the said post.

(2) He further submits that the performance of the petitioner is better than other candidates in the interview, as well as in the physical test.

28 28

Despite having better performance, the petitioner could not be selected and the respondents are proceeding with the selection process.

(3) The petitioner has not submitted any document, except his selfsame statement to the fact that he is better qualified. It is well known that when a person appears in the exam he feels that he is the best and better qualified. In absence of necessary documents, it is not possible to accept the mere statement of the petitioner. Even otherwise, there is no semblance of any right or breach thereof to invoke extra ordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

(4) The petition lacks material facts and merit. It is thus, dismissed summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Karuna